UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The A B C of Human Relations - *Sunder Joshi*

The Fundamentalists Are Right! - - - - - - - - - - *J. Hutton Hynd*

Ingrid and the Bomb - *Herbert H. Stroup*

Between an Atom and a Star - - - - - - - - - - - - *Peter H. Samsom*

What Is This Neo-Orthodoxy? - - - - - - - - - - *Karl M. Chworowsky*

Western Conference News

VOLUME CXXXVI NUMBER 2

Chicago, May-June, 1950

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 25 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter June 11, 1947, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Bernard Baum: Professor, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

Karl M. Chworowsky: Minister of the Fourth Unitarian-Congregational Society of Brooklyn, New York.

Sylvanus M. Duvall: Professor, George Williams College, Chicago.

C. A. Hawley: Head of the Department of English Literature, Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kansas.

J. Hutton Hynd: Leader of the St. Louis Ethical Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

Sunder Joshi: Public Lecturer, University of Chicago.

Jack Mendelsohn, Jr.: Minister of The Church of the Christian Union (Unitarian), Rockford, Illinois.

Peter H. Samsom: Minister of the First Unitarian Church of San Diego, California.

Herbert H. Stroup: Professor, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, New York.

Contents

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE 23

ARTICLES—

The A B C of Human Relations—SUNDER JOSHI 24
The Fundamentalists Are Right!—J. HUTTON HYND 26
Ingrid and the Bomb—HERBERT H. STROUP 31
Between an Atom and a Star—PETER H. SAMSOM 32
What Is This Neo-Orthodoxy?—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 34

POETRY—

Epistle to John Ruskin—LEGARDE S. DOUGHTY 30

THE STUDY TABLE—

Books with a Meaning—C. A. HAWLEY 36
Christ a Yogi—SYLVANUS M. DUVALL 36
Functional Significance of Values—JACK MENDELSOHN, JR. 37
Oriental Mystery Religions Neglected—SYLVANUS M. DUVALL .. 37
The Primacy of Ephraim—BERNARD BAUM 37

CORRESPONDENCE—

Replying to Mr. Taylor—LEO KAUL 38

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 39

THE FIELD—

Reports from the "Truman Doctrine" Area—*Worldover Press* ... 22

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Reports from the "Truman Doctrine" Area

Turkey Gets Liberal Law

Ankara. — Ever since the Truman doctrine brought Turkey into America's sphere, it has been common to refer to her as "reactionary." Those in the West who still think of this country in terms of Kemal Ataturk's old dictatorship, however, will be unprepared for the liberalism of Turkey's new electoral law.

During the war, maladministration and inflation brought a popular clamor for freedom and reform, and President Ismet Inonu reached the decision that Turkey should be a democracy. That paved the way for the creation, very soon after the war, of a Democratic Party—and the start of a genuine two-party system.

With the slogan, "secret ballot, open count," the new party demanded that the judiciary control the polls during elections. Even under the old system, it won a considerable number of seats in the last (1946) elections.

During the last year, thorough study was made of electoral laws in the western democracies. A committee of experts, largely university professors, then drew up recommendations which are the basis of the new law.

Significantly, spokesman for the government in Parliament's debate was Vice Premier Nihat Erim, 37-year-old former professor of law, who in 1947 developed a liberal wing in the ruling People's Party. Significantly, too, the Democrats voted for the act.

Moscow Makes it Tough for Reds in Israel

Tel Aviv. — A Soviet press attack on Israel's Foreign Minister, Moshe Sharett, has been a shock here which will not help the cause of Communism in this corner of the Near East.

Ostensibly, the Soviet Literary Gazette was unhappy about Israel's decision not to join the Russian-

(*Continued on page* 36)

UNITY

Volume CXXXVI MAY-JUNE, 1950 No. 2

EDITORIAL

Child guidance has come to be one of the major concerns of socially minded people. It has long been so with Abraham Lincoln Centre; and the Centre does not think of the Child Guidance Clinic as an appendage to the settlement program or as a transplanted novelty, but as something native to settlement philosophy. For more than ten years Abraham Lincoln Centre has operated a Child Guidance Clinic under the expert direction of Dr. Rudolf Dreikurs. Such a clinic has in it aspects of both social casework and social groupwork. The original interviews are taken by a social worker; the treatment is after the fashion of groupwork. During the clinic session the children are engaged in supervised play and in psycho-dramatics. The parents, the staff, and other interested persons are in a sort of "round table" gathering. On the basis of a face-sheet report of the social worker, the psychiatrist or the counselor discusses the case with the parent and the group. The parent then retires and the child enters the group; the psychiatrist or counselor conducts a discussion with the child regarding matters indicated in the social worker's report or in the discussion with the parent. It is amazing with what freedom children discuss problems with the counselor in general disregard of others present. The child then returns to the playroom, the parent reënters the session, and the parent is counseled specifically on the matters that are causing concern. Other parents and staff members enter into the discussion. Parents soon learn that problems heretofore thought to be exclusively visited upon them, for what punitive reason they know not, are in fact the common experience of innumerable parents, and that the problems are not something to create shame but to be brought out into the open and faced. After parents learn that little Johnny is not a vicious exception to the ordinary civilized behavior of the human species, and that other parents also have little Johnny troubles, they are then better equipped to deal realistically and understandingly with their problems. Suggestions and recommendations are made, and there are follow-up interviews. The point of special interest is that while a particular parent and a particular child are being dealt with — some two to four such cases in a session — actually a process of parent education is going on in which larger numbers are involved. The true significance of a Child Guidance Center is in the larger results in parent education. This group process of counseling and guidance is necessary if any considerable number of people are ever to be helped. The slow process of individual analysis so beloved by many psychiatrists, and the slow process of individual treatment so enshrined in social casework, while doubtless beneficial to a comparatively few people, cannot meet the needs of a poorly adjusted and poorly educated mass population. The Settlement appears to me to be peculiarly equipped to go in for counseling and guidance in a large way. Some such orientation as I have indicated should give a new sense of purpose to settlement programs, and supply them with techniques that would lift them to a new sense of accomplishment.

Curtis W. Reese.

The A B C of Human Relations

SUNDER JOSHI

Among all the challenges which our generation faces today, none is greater than the challenge of human relations. And it becomes a double defiance when people regard it as no defiance at all. For if the nations cannot live together, then civilization may not survive. That was Roosevelt's farewell message to humanity.

But this challenge can be partially met by our own American, Christian, and democratic methods. Even the free enterprise spirit of open competition can be applied to the market place of ideas. And it is in this realm of ideas wherein lies the ABC of human relations. You cannot fight or befriend anybody *intelligently* unless you know what, why, and how he thinks.

Most of us think in terms of our own customs and culture. That is very natural. But close to two billion people today think in terms of cultures other than our own. Their history, religion, politics, etc., make them psychologically what they are. America's victory in weapons can be matched by a victory in idea-weapons if we can be well-informed along these lines. This double victory in physical and mental power could guarantee the continuity of our greatness. It would also lessen the tensions in human relations.

This is not only a matter of playing Santa Claus to the world. Our American global leadership is at stake. Unless we can anticipate the innate trends of national psychology among the sixty odd nations, we will merely be fighting blind. That is an awful waste of energy. Wisdom requires that we know what makes the world tick, why people behave the way they do. To do this, we must examine the relationship between culture, religion, and nationalism in the world context. This requires the courage of going beyond thinking merely in terms of one's own tradition. If knowledge is power, then let us be strong.

"Yes," some of you will say, "but we may lose our cultural identity." Will we? Are we that afraid of our own ideas? On the contrary, democracy is made stronger by putting its ideas to test in the open battle of world ideologies. We become better Americans. We have nothing to lose but much to profit.

Let us first examine the mechanics of human relations in terms of world cultures. Then we can go into the problem of how religion and nationalism combine to make the political perspectives of Asia and Europe. Human relations can then be viewed in their historic background. We can then realize how the present is the child of the past. Only then can we apply rational remedies to conditions we wish to change.

While it is purely an accident whether we were born in Boston, Bombay, or Borneo, why should anybody perpetuate the conflicts that lie behind that accident? Human relations point out that since it is not our fault that we were born where we were, there is really no need to be condemned by the social, religious, or political consequences of such an accident. This is the greater meaning of democracy: to better our condition and free ourselves from the tyranny of circumstance. There is no reason to die as an untouchable just because one is born as one. We can conquer our past and rise above it.

Permit me to tell you how my own life illustrates this. My ancestry is that of the Brahmin aristocrat from India. My early environment was Muslim. My faith is Christian. My uncle was the first Indian canon of the Bombay Cathedral. My father was a poor high school headmaster. But this accident of circumstance did not stop us. We came from India to America on borrowed money and under difficulties bordering on stark tragedy. However, we did not let our problems solve us. My three degrees in six fields of the humanities and the social sciences represent an education in five universities on three continents—Asia, Europe, and America. I am an educational blend of many cultures. And when I became an American citizen, it was a moment of supreme transfiguration. In that great moment, whatever was Hindu or Muslim or Indian in me became fused with all that was American. My pantheon of heroes was enlarged beyond national or continental limits. Tom Paine, Jefferson, and Abe Lincoln were equally mine along with Asoka, Buddha, and Gandhi. East and West did finally meet. Kipling was wrong.

To grow in the direction of bigger *inclusions,* instead of being compelled to live with the big *exclusions* (or prejudices under which we were born)—this seems to be the elementary requisite of human relations. Not only to tolerate other people but to understand them is part of the business of growing up. As the world becomes smaller in technological terms, our minds must become universal in stature. Today, the world community is a technological fact. Can we make it a mental fact?

By that I mean, can we bring ourselves to think of world cultures in terms of the *common* concepts which humanity shares? In our history of civilization courses at many of the great universities, very few of them go into the element of *continuity* which pervades civilizations. For instance, we all know that Western civilization rests on Hebrew, Greek, and Christian foundations. But do we know that hidden behind these three, there is the substructure of Asia? Why not get the total perspective instead of the partial view?

We can appreciate American and European civilizations much better that way. Thus the peoples of the world become the heirs of the ages. No longer do we need to think in terms of Occident *versus* Orient but in terms of growth and relationship. Why should mental blinders exist in our history of philosophy or great books courses when we know, for instance, that even pre-Greek Egyptian wisdom is part of our possession by way of the Old Testament's Book of Proverbs? Think of our greater cultural richness when we can claim as ours not only Jesus and Moses and Plato, but also Ikhnaton, Confucius, and even Muslim philosophers of the Middle Ages. Yes, our own Thomas Jefferson knew about Confucius' educational theories, and Emerson was a student of Hindu philosophy.

Furthermore, human relations can be greatly strengthened if we review some of the *common* concepts in various cultures. And they are common because they are fundamental. For instance, Socrates, Confucius, and the Hindu Sankara prescribed "Know

Thyself" as the beginning of wisdom. Socrates and Manu of India agree that social classes perform the function of service. Aristotle and Confucius recommend music as a part of education. Jesus would find more in common with Buddha and Gandhi than with Kant and Hegel. Mocius, Hobbes, and Locke have common concern in the political theory of social contract. Laotse and Rousseau may be termed the original nature boys; the back to nature movement. Any cultural history could tell you that ancient Persia, Israel, and Christianity would *fundamentally* agree on the issues of heaven, hell, angels, and the devil himself. And today China's Renaissance leader, Hu Shih, is a direct disciple of America's own John Dewey and his scientific method. Nehru combines East and West. He is equally at home in Indian or Western clothes; in Boston hat or Gandhi cap.

In the political realm, human relations demand a comprehension of the background of nationalistic perspectives. For that we must go to world religions. Yes, religion is the psychological tie that binds nationalistically. Throughout history, religion has combined the elements—race, language, literature, mythology, and land—that went into the political cocktail of nationalism. That which colors a man's nationalism is his religious heritage to a great extent. Why? Because religion the world over represents all the precious cultural values from time immemorial. This is the very basic "basic" in the meaning of human relations. To understand a man's political loyalty, you must know his religious or cultural loyalty.

With this in mind, let us approach today's nationalisms of the majority of mankind. Let us make an ideological tour of the Near East, Middle East, Far East, and Europe. That would cover the Jewish, Muslim, Hindu, Chinese, Japanese, and European peoples.

Modern Israel's political perspective can be discovered in terms of the Hebrew tradition. The conflict between Arab and Jew goes back to that essentially. Moses himself gave the foundation ideas of monotheism, the chosen people, the ten commandments, etc. Within this framework—and the social justice of Amos and Isaiah—political Zionism has evolved.

Arab nationalism and the Pakistan political mentality may be understood by the background factors as given by Mohammed and others. The strict monotheism of Allah (the God of Islam), the Koranic scriptures, the Arabic language, *Jihad* (holy war), and a society of equals which rejects caste and color lines—all these elements enter into the political psychology of the Muslim, perhaps unconsciously. Traditionally, the two worlds of believers and infidels are in constant conflict. Political war is religious war. For the orthodox, there is no rest till the world becomes Muslim. But these people of the Near East are a polite, proud, and patient people. Here at the crossroads of the world, how will oil and democracy mix?

In order to understand Prime Minister Nehru of India, you must first know Gandhi. His great dictum was: Whatever is morally wrong could never be politically right. The good end does not justify the bad means. Gandhi's political religion—or India's nationalism—consists of Jesus' Sermon on the Mount, the Gita (New Testament of the Hindus), Henry Thoreau's *Civil Disobedience,* and other ideas. The mystical element is dominant where soul force is more important than physical force. Hence the trend toward a God-centered state. All this is one psychological reason for India's political neutrality in the turbulent scene of power politics. But the Gita does leave the door open. It says that duty could justify the use of force.

Chinese political thinking goes back to Confucius, Mencius, and a down-to-earth man-centered philosophy. Chiang Kai-shek himself states his adherence to Confucian principles in his book, *China's Destiny.* Foremost among these principles is: Government by the "superior man." That is where moral propriety results in social prestige and political power. The ethical aristocrat is both scholar and bureaucrat. Mencius advises revolt against tyranny. Till recently, examinations for government jobs were based on the Confucian classics. However, the guiding genius behind today's nationalism is the late Dr. Sun Yat-sen—the George Washington of China—and his San-Min-Chu-I. These people's principles include nationalism, people's rights, and people's livelihood. But it is the third principle of better living for the masses which may explain why China was oriented toward Communism—ideologically.

Japanese nationalism revolves around Shinto or the Way of the Gods. It is a religion that demands patriotism. The Emperor is divinity itself. Bushido is the Way of the Warrior. Here the soldier saint reaches for the heaven of absolute militarism. Death is better than shame. Such tradition shapes the national outlook. How will American democracy fit into this heritage? Will it change Japan? Or, will it be changed to suit Japanese conditions, as was the case with Buddhism imported from India, and Confucianism imported from China?

Let us now turn to Europe. The Renaissance, Reformation, democracy, and capitalism are the individualisms of culture, religion, politics, and economics. To what extent each has influenced the other, it is hard to determine. But the chronological order in history is significant: Martin Luther, John Calvin, John Locke, Adam Smith, and John Stuart Mill. These men represent the basic direction of modern Western civilization. It consists of Lutheran Protestant individualism, Calvinism's capitalistic morality, Lockean sacredness of life, liberty and property, Smith's textbook on free enterprise, and Mill's spirit of liberty. These individualisms in the various realms constitute the foundations of democracy, but religion led the way.

These are the psychological determinants behind some billion and a half people's political perspectives. Anybody who seeks international harmony must know what, why, and how the world thinks. Otherwise, he marches blind in a pea-soup fog.

Now, the "fundamental" problems of all peoples are more or less the same; whether security, survival, or anything else. But the methods of solution of these problems are different because of divergence in religion, nationalism, and culture. If we can understand *both* the problems and the psychological perspectives of peoples, America can remain the world's moderator for a thousand years to come.

Behind human relations there are ideas that men will die for: ideas which force cannot kill. Yes, ideas are still stronger than atom bombs!

The Fundamentalists Are Right!

J. HUTTON HYND

I am convinced that the time has come when we must make a clear and definite distinction between the fundamentals of religion, as religion, and the fundamentals of particular religions. It is time to ask: What are the fundamentals of religion as an aspect of human experience? What are the fundamentals of a particular religion—say, of Christianity or of Judaism?

Since these two religions are familiar to us, and are influential among us, we may make reference to them, by way of example, as we proceed to make the distinction between religion in general and religions in particular; and since these two religions are a part of our common culture, it will be seen that our discussion is likely to have an important and practical bearing upon our everyday life. Academic and theoretical though the discussion may seem to be, we ask you to "stay with us" in thought as we proceed to the practical issues of the subject.

Perhaps a hint of the practical aspects of the subject should be given at once. A particular religion, like Christianity or Judaism, is likely to be a vital part of a certain civilization or culture. It is not an isolated phenomenon. It is a system of belief and behavior—and, with its usages and institutions, it is based upon certain premises, upon certain foundations or fundamentals. Should these foundations or fundamentals be undermined, the system is likely to fall into desuetude and decay; and a civilization is likely to fall with it, thus reducing our common life to chaos and confusion in belief and behavior. Men and women would then conclude, that, since a particular religion passed away, there is no place for religion. Such a conclusion would lead, in due course, to serious consequences. Even now, millions in the United States of America are standing outside the orthodox system of Judaism and Christianity, making of their rejection of these systems an excuse or a reason for their neglect of religion and its particular values and institutions. The situation has danger in it. Accordingly, we are asking that a clear distinction be made between the foundations of a particular religion and the foundations of religion.

As an example of a particular religion, let us consider the Christian religion, or, more accurately, the Hebrew-Christian religion. This religion is based upon certain foundations or fundamentals: and the persons who are called "Fundamentalists" are those who state quite emphatically what the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion are, and who declare that apart from these doctrines there is no real Christian religion. The Fundamentalists say: Dissolve the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion, and there is no Christian church, there is no Christian civilization. I wish to say that, in their general position and claim, I think the Fundamentalists are right! Indeeed, I wish to insist upon it that the Fundamentalists are right; for it is only by insisting that they are right in their claim that we shall know where *we* stand regarding the fundamentals of particular religions and the fundamentals of religion. I should make it clear at once that I do not accept as true the doctrines of the Hebrew-Christian religion, but I respect the claim of the Fundamentalists as over against certain claims of liberals and modernists.

What are the fundamental doctrines of the Hebrew-Christian religion? The answer calls for a long story, but we must perforce be very brief.

In order to understand the doctrines of the Christian religion one must have an understanding of the Hebrew religion—sometimes referred to as Judaism. In order to understand the New Testament, the main textbook of Christianity, one must have an understanding of the Old Testament, as one of the chief textbooks of Judaism; and there is a considerable volume of literature associated with both Testaments to be taken into account.

In the Old Testament we have a remarkable composition of various sorts of literature. It carries an amazing conglomeration of fact and fiction. The scholars are not yet agreed upon what is fact and what is fiction. Be that as it may, we can say that certain ideas and doctrines have emerged from the conglomeration, to become the fundamental premises of a particular system of religion. The matter at issue at this moment is not whether certain emergent ideas and doctrines are related to facts; the point to be noted is that a certain group of people believed them to be related to facts. First, they imagined them to be related to facts, and then believed them to be so related. "What we had imagined, we believed," as Thomas Hardy says; and in due course these ideas and doctrines were to become like so many pieces of rock and stone, broken from many age-long sources and formations, and cemented together by the thoughts and emotions of a certain group of persons, to become the fundamentals of a religious system. On this rock of fundamentals, so to speak, the Hebrew-Christian church or system was built.

The first idea to be noted is the idea of God. Among the Hebrew peoples, it would seem, the tribal god, as one among many, became the universal God, as the one and only. The notion that there is but one God became fixed and final. This God, it was believed further, chose a person named Abraham to be the father of a chosen people, by whom all the peoples of the earth were to be blessed. This blessing was to come to mankind by virtue of the fact (or fiction) that this God would give his own Law to this chosen people, who were to become custodians of this Law. In due course, the story runs, this Law was given to Moses, who in turn, gave it to the chosen people. In part ceremonial, in part moral, this Law was believed to be original and unique; and this belief became fixed and final. (Let it be said, in passing, that the truly ethical part of the Law, which includes the Ten Commandments, is one of the finest contributions ever made to the moral life of mankind by means of a religious system.) Added to the idea of the Law is the idea of the Land. It was believed that this God had promised a certain piece of land to Abraham and his people; that the piece of land was that area known today as Palestine. In due course, the land was taken by strategy and slaughter, and the Hebrew people moved in to settle down and claim it as the land promised by their God to Abraham. This belief became fixed and final. After their settlement in the promised land, the Hebrew

people developed a culture of their own—and a political system, under kings. The kingdom was divided—Israel in the north, Judah in the south—but it was believed that, in due time, the kings of the chosen people would reign from a certain center in Palestine, over all the peoples of the earth—thus bringing to mankind the blessing promised under Abraham. Of the Hebrew rulers, King David had set up his citadel at Jerusalem, and it came to be believed that Jerusalem would be the center from which God would reign in his kingdom, through his own appointed agents. But another idea emerged. When the monarchies of the Hebrews were dissolved, and when the promised land suffered invasion and the chosen people oppression, it came to be believed that God would send his own agent, an "anointed Servant," a Messiah (perhaps of the House of David), who would destroy the enemies of the chosen people and set up the Kingdom of God in the promised land, and thus usher in the age of peace and prosperity for all mankind. The idea of a Messiah became fixed and final.

These ideas, as containing elements of fact and fiction, emerged from the experience, the emotions, and the imagination of a people, and from the speculations and creations of poets and prophets and other gifted persons,— the ideas, as of one God, one supreme Law, a Chosen People, a Promised Land, a Messiah and a Kingdom of God. These ideas and doctrines came together within the intense emotional life of a proud and gifted people, and were cemented together by its creative leaders to become the foundations, or the fundamentals, of a system at once religious, racial, and political. The political aspects tended to dissolve with time, but the religious and racial aspects of the system remained to become established in due course as the religious system known today as Judaism.

Now, it must be conceded that the ideas and doctrines which we have outlined should be taken as the fundamentals of Judaism. The Fundamentalists among the believers in Judaism claim that in these fundamental ideas and doctrines, as presented literally in the literature of the Old Testament, we see the true Judaism, apart from which there can be no other; and I am inclined to the opinion that the Fundamentalists are right! There are those who say that they are of Judaism—yet who declare that they do not accept the Old Testament idea of God, or of the Law of Moses, or of the Chosen People, or of the Promised Land, or of the Messiah, or of the Kingdom of God; they say that they are "Reformed" or "Reconstructionist." Of them the Fundamentalists say that they are not "the true Israel"—and I think the Fundamentalists are right! I would say that the men and women of the Reformed and Reconstructionist persuasions are moving nearer to the truth concerning religion than the Fundamentalists—but that the Fundamentalists are right when they claim that the ideas and doctrines, as outlined by us, are Judaism—the religious system known by that name, if the name is to make any honest sense at all. Why confuse a clear enough issue to no real purpose, except it be to the deceiving of ourselves and others? Why not keep the channels of language and communication clear?

But let us move on quickly to the consideration of the other ideas which emerged, and which gave us, in due time, the Christian religion, as a development out of Judaism, with later additions from the mystery cults of Oriental and Mediterranean peoples.

Judaism had set up the keeping of the Law as being the central point of precept and practice, the Law, ceremonial and moral. There were those who took their religion seriously and tried to keep the Law, in letter and in spirit. There were sincere pietists and perfectionists in Judaism who said that it was not enough merely to keep the letter of the Law, as in outward formalities; the spirit of the Law must be lived in daily life. Love is the spirit of the Law, they declared, and it is by the spirit of love that the Law is fulfilled; and they added the belief that the Messiah would not come to set up the Kingdom of God until the Chosen People, or a certain proportion of them, had attained to the keeping of the Law in spirit, in the "inward parts"; the Law being written, not on tables of stone but upon the fleshy tables of the heart: quoting thus from the prophecy of Jeremiah.

Traces of this pietistic and perfectionistic movement in Judaism are to be found in the literature of the New Testament—especially in the Gospels. So far as they may be accepted as historical persons, it would seem that the Jesus of the Gospels and his disciples belonged to some such movement. Jesus and his followers expected the Messiah to come, but they believed that he would not come until the righteousness of the people of Israel "exceeded the righteousness" of the legalists and formalists among them. The emphasis was placed upon the keeping of the Law in terms of the spirit of Love. Not so much as a thought of hatred or of resentment or of adultery was allowed. (This inner pietism and perfectionism is carried over to this day in the perfectionist and Messianist groups within Judaism and Christianity.)

From this Hebrew Pietism and perfectionism a new and startling development took place. Distinct traces of the new development are to be found in the letters of the New Testament, put forward as the letters of one named Paul. This new movement takes his name, Paulinism—but we may suppose that the movement had its rise within the experience of several individuals rather than of one. The movement is expounded as though it were the experience of one person, known as Paul—who is referred to as "an Hebrew of the Hebrews, circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin; as touching the Law, a Pharisee"—that is, a pietist, having a deep respect for the Law. There were many such persons within the Hebrew system. They took the Law seriously; they tried to keep the Law in thought as well as in practice. (Even were all the letters of the New Testament to be proved as not having been written by Paul, they would still afford evidence of this significant spiritual movement within the Hebrew system.)

What is the nature of this movement? The answer should not be missed! Many pious Hebrews, striving to keep the Law, in letter and in spirit, made the disconcerting discovery that, no matter how much they tried to keep the Law, they failed to keep it perfectly. "When I would do good, evil is present with me!" they exclaimed; and following this discovery they came to a startling conclusion — a conclusion which laid the foundations for the Christian movement.

What was the startling conclusion? They concluded (after trying experience and tortuous speculation, we may suppose) that it was utterly impossible for any man or woman to keep the Law, either in letter or in

spirit. Into this line of speculation came the doctrine of the Fall of Man, as it is suggested in the Genesis story. As a consequence of this Fall, they declared, human nature is corrupt, sinful, wicked; and the keeping of any moral law is beyond the power of any son or daughter of Adam and Eve. Indeed, the speculation was carried further, and it was declared that the Law had been given to the Hebrews by their God—not in the hope that it might be kept either in letter or in spirit, but to the end that the Law might become the instrument by which mankind would discover its utter corruption and sinfulness and wickedness. Let a man try to keep the Law—just let him try—and he will discover how impotent he is, how sinful he is! "I had not known sin, but by the law," says someone in the letter to the Romans. "For I had not known lust, except the law had said, 'Thou shalt not covet.'" Here is a remarkable conclusion concerning the Law; that it was given, not that it might be kept; it was given so that every Hebrew, and every man and woman of the human race (for this Law was to be given to the Gentiles) should come to know how utterly and sinfully impotent they are regarding any attainment to righteousness or holiness. The Law would teach every one of us that he is "born in sin and shapen in iniquity," that the human heart is "deceitful and above all things desperately wicked."

Now it will be seen that this conclusion was a radical departure from the central position of Judaism, which emphasized the keeping of the Law. Indeed, this conclusion is a radical departure from all moral and ethical systems, because it declares that no matter how much a person may try to keep the highest and finest moral precepts he will be certain to fail utterly. "Love thy neighbor as thyself"; fine—but it cannot be done! "Do unto others as you would that they should do unto you"; fine—but it cannot be done! No matter how high the precept, how fine the principle, Man is utterly without power to follow it, either in the letter or in spirit. It is suggested, then, that Man of himself is utterly without hope in the matter of living a moral life. He may make as many laws as he likes—personal, social, national, or international—in the making of his laws he will simply make the discovery that he cannot keep any one of them! All his efforts to live a moral life are doomed to failure. "For I know that within me . . . dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would, I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. O wretched man that I am!"—so said, and so exclaimed, the person who wrote the letter to the Romans; and he applied his own experience, his own speculations, and his own sentiments, to every man and every woman as children of Adam and Eve. Set up your systems of ethics if you wish, it is now declared, in Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Judaism, Humanism; it is of no use! As we would say in this country, in this moral game, "we cannot reach first base," for we are disabled and crippled sinners, contaminated all by Adamic sin!

Yet, according to this line of speculation, Man is not entirely without hope. Another development in thought takes place—far too complicated to deal with in detail; but the development is summed up in a sentence from the New Testament letter to the Galatians: "Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ." The Law would teach us our sinfulness and our weakness; and this discovery of our true state, regarding our attempts to live a moral life would or should bring us to Christ. In this thought, we come to the "good news" or "Gospel of Jesus Christ."

Who is this Christ? The answer implies a story long and exceedingly involved, running through mazes of speculation. Suffice it to say that this Christ is none other than the Hebrew Messiah; not necessarily the Jesus of the Gospels, but the Messiah or agent of God conceived as an idea in the mind and emotion of the Hebrew people, and believed, in due course, to be the agent of God who was willing to be "the Lamb of God, slain from the foundation of the world" on a Heavenly altar, offering himself up as an atonement for the sins of mankind (not necessarily on the Cross of Calvary), that men might be justified before God, receiving forgiveness of sins (following the ancient pattern of Hebrew blood-sacrifice, offered to the Hebrew God as an atonement for sins).

But it was declared that forgiveness of sins is not enough. A man may have his sins forgiven, but he may fail again and yet again in the keeping of the Law. He is still a son of Adam, bearing the taint of Adam's sin! If he wishes to be successful in the keeping of the Law, so that he may have a place in the coming Kingdom of God, he must become a new creature, he must be "born again," he must become a "son of God". How, then, shall a man be born again? The answer is that he may be born again, "not of the flesh but of the spirit"; and Christ, the Hebrew Messiah, is conceived of as the agent of God, as a "quickening spirit," by whom such a radical spiritual change is to be effected —so that a man or a woman may become a "new creature in Christ Jesus"—in which miraculous operation a person's nature is completely changed, as by supernatural grace, so that he is now able to keep the Law, in the letter and in the spirit—the Law being written upon the tables of his heart.

This was spoken of as "the new covenant". In the "old covenant" God had given the Hebrews the Law and the Land; in the "new covenant" God gives the Hebrews and all mankind the power to keep the Law, and so to achieve the good moral life which they seek, as achieving it partly in this life and partly in a life beyond the grave (for by this time the doctrine of the resurrection of the body and life everlasting had come into the speculations of the new movement among the Hebrews).

"Wherefore the Law is our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ"—for justification by faith, and for the regeneration and sanctification of our sinful nature, so that we may forevermore be free from the external forms of the Law, and live henceforth according to its spirit, so that love in us and in our behavior may become the fulfilling of the Law, a fulfillment which guarantees that we shall have a place in the Kingdom of God, perhaps in this world, perhaps in another world. So runs this new development of thought within Judaism; and in this new development we have the new religious system which came to be known as the Christian religion. In this Christian system, the Law is no longer the center of the people's worship, as in Judaism. Christ is now the center—in the crucifix or cross, in the wine or in the wafer of the Roman Rite, in the sacrament of the Protestant Communion, or in his imagined "Presence". Certain practices of Oriental

and Mediterranean mystery cults were added to the general speculations which we have tried to follow—giving us the Christian religion as we know it today. In Judaism it is Torah: In Christianity it is Christ: "The Law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ."

What are the fundamentals of this Christian religion—and all its institutions, be they of Rome or of Reformation? Let us make no mistake about this. Why confuse the issue? This is the fundamental feature of the Christian religion—it is the emphasis upon the belief that Man is weak and sinful, and utterly unable to keep any sort of moral law, or to follow any sort of moral precept. It is especially stated, when a man seems to be moral, he is but a "whited sepulchre"; he is cleaning and whitewashing the outside, while the inside remains corrupt. A man cannot follow the precepts of Mount Sinai, or the principles of the Sermon on the Mount. Let him try to follow the so-called ethical teachings of Judaism, or of Jesus, of any other system or of any other teacher, and he will simply discover how utterly sinful he is, and that he must be "born again"; and he will discover that it is only through the supernatural power and grace of Christ as a living spirit that he can be so changed as to be able to live a moral life. "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." This doctrine is the final and fundamental doctrine of the Christian system, with all its institutions, as we know it today. Apart from this fundamental doctrine, the Christian church has no meaning. So say the Fundamentalists—and the Fundamentalists are right! The only persons who have the clear right to call themselves Christians are those who accept the fundamental feature of the Christian system. The Christian system is not primarily a system of ethics—it is a system of supernatural salvation. The Fundamentalists are right when they declare this to be the fundamental doctrinal feature of the Christian religion; be they Fundamentalists of Rome or of Reformation.

Now, I should say again, quite plainly, that I do not accept, as being true, the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion. There is not an article of the Christian creed about which I can say that I can accept it, if I am to be honest with myself and with others. The ideas which give content and form to the Christian faith have a pedigree—and, as Lord Acton said, "Few discoveries are more irritating than those which expose the pedigree of ideas!" The pedigree of the Hebrew and Christian ideas has been exposed—and we cannot accept them as being adequate representations of historical or actual reality; as, by the same token, we cannot accept the fundamental ideas of Hindu or Buddhist speculation. We find our historical continuity with particular religious systems, not in following their fixed and final ideas and traditions, but in seeking to understand them, and seeking to go beyond them to the understanding of religion as an aspect of human experience which must be honored and dealt with in terms of its own nature, and in terms of its own right to claim our intelligence and our emotion.

But here is my main point. Many within the Christian system, discovering the pedigree of the fundamental ideas of the Christian faith, have, perhaps like myself, rejected those ideas (after the manner of some within the system of Judaism). They say that they are liberals, modernists; and they declare quite openly, frankly, that they do not believe the fundamental doctrines of justification by faith in Christ, or of supernatural regeneration and sanctification by the power of Christ; and they suggest that Christianity is just an ethical system like any other such, and that the living of the Christian life is but a matter of following the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount, that "going to church" is a matter of listening to ethical homilies in a helpful and uplifting atmosphere.

The Fundamentalists say that the liberals and modernists, by virtue of their declared dissent and dissimulation, have no right to be within the Christian system or the Christian church; and I am here to say that I think the Fundamentalists to be right! The liberals and modernists, the reformists and reconstructionists, have no right to stay within either Judaism or Christianity while they try to explain away the very fundamentals of each faith; they have no right to use the names they profess! They should, in all honesty, assume another name. This is the claim of the orthodox. In this claim, the Fundamentalists are right!

Now, it is by this insistence that the Fundamentalists are right, in their claims against the so-called liberals and modernists, that we, you and I, come to know where we stand regarding the fundamentals of particular religions and the fundamentals of religion. Personally, I reject the fundamentals of Judaism and Christianity as particular religions, but I wish to move forward to find the fundamentals of religion as such. When I reject Judaism or Christianity I do not of necessity reject religion; rather I go forward to find it, and to find its true fundamentals; and upon these fundamentals I may build a religious system in keeping with the highest intelligence and deepest emotions of mankind. I must never make my rejection of Judaism, or of Christianity, or of Hinduism, or of Buddhism, a mere excuse for my neglect of religion. My concern for true religion, and my care of it, should be one of the chief duties of my citizenship within the commonwealth of mankind. You say you do not believe the fundamental doctrines of Judaism, or the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. What of it? We ask you to leave Judaism and Christianity to the Fundamentalists—and to come, with all liberals and modernists, and all reformists and reconstructionists, to give strength and impetus to a united effort to place the institutions of religion on their true foundations, so that the enlightened religious impulse may consecrate the common life to the achievement of the common good. There is urgency in this appeal. I would say here that one of the men who pointed the way to better understanding and building up of the religious life, as American citizens, following the tradition of religious liberty, was Felix Adler, who, with his colleagues, founded the first Ethical Society in New York City, as a liberal religious fellowship: a fellowship within which all men and women of good faith and good will may be permitted to cooperate for the common good, in the name of common ideals of an ethical and spiritual sort—placing faith in Man's power, by cooperative endeavor, to achieve a Good Life, personally, socially, nationally, internationally; quite apart from any fundamentals of particular religions like Judaism or Christianity or any other, yet having respect for what each may have to offer to the moral and the spiritual traditions of the human race, not forgetting the facts concerning human nature. Felix

Adler, and others like him, pointed the way in which all liberals and modernists in religion should move; they should give the fundamentals of particular religion into the care of the Fundamentalists, and should move toward the fundamentals of religion. This, I suggest, is the only fair and honest path a heretic should take—even in the interests of historical continuity, and as making due acknowledgment of his great debt to the system which he must perforce leave behind him!

What is the fundamental fact or feature of religion as religion? We should ask this, as we near conclusion. Let one of the outstanding scholars in the field of religion answer in a sentence—Dr. A. Eustace Haydon of the University of Chicago, now Leader of the Ethical Society of Chicago; he says: "One thing is fundamental in all religions—the creative drive of human desire for the values of a satisfying life". It can be said, that behind this creative drive there is a dynamic interest—Man's interest in the Good, or the Good Life (which in this instance is more than the moral life, which applies only to human relations; we have in mind, Man's total relation, and the notion of a Good Life which may be associated with it). This interest in the Good (as in what life should be, extending beyond what life is) is a dynamic interest which leads to definite activity—and to the building up of certain institutions, which become the custodian of the traditions and techniques by which a Good Life is to be achieved. "Religion" is the name we give to this dynamic interest. "Science" is the name we give to Man's dynamic creative interest in finding the facts and knowing the truth; "Art" is the name we give to Man's dynamic and creative interest in proportion and beauty; "Religion" is the name we give to the dynamic and creative interest in the Good. Science, Art, Religion—each with its own institutions—these three; and perhaps the greatest of these is Religion, since it is the religious impulse which should direct and consecrate the activities of mankind to the service of the Good Life. If science discovers atomic energy, Religion, with the aid of Art, should direct us in the right use of atomic energy. I do not speak here of any particular religion—I speak of religion as such, as having its own fundamental fact and feature, by which mankind may yet be united in its creative drive for the values of a satisfying life for all, in terms of worthy achievement and fulfillment. Through the generations, Man, seeking the Good Life, has tried to be creative in his magic, in his supernaturalism, in his superstition—now let him try to be creative in terms of his scientific knowledge, his technical skill, and his ideals of the good; thus giving expression to the religious interest and activity, as a vital part of a people's culture.

This interpretation of religion, as following the tradition of democratic freedom as it is to be found in American history, might have become a matter of general acceptance in this country, to the great good of the people and its culture; but millions of immigrants came to this continent, bringing their particular religions with them; and, becoming powerful and influential, these religions, each with its own fundamentals, checked the development of a truer religion. If a more rational and ethical religion had been allowed to take its course, and if it had received the intelligent support of the citizens of this country, it would have played a more significant part in the history of this land—as in uniting its various peoples and cultures in the service of the common good. The children of this country would have been united in their religious education—for the teaching of true religion would have taken its rightful place with the teaching of science and of art, and of all the other subjects by which a people's culture is to be sustained, enriched, and developed. Today, millions of our citizens are bound by the fundamentals of particular religions, and millions of them are standing outside the particular religions because they cannot accept the fundamentals. The situation is serious. If our culture is to survive and develop as it should, the fundamentals of true religion must be discovered by the people—and upon these fundamentals the institutions of religion must be built, to the end that the traditions and techniques of true religion might be preserved from generation to generation. Said Julian Huxley, distinguished scientist and Humanist, formerly Director of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization: "I believe that one of the greatest defects of our modern world is its lack of a religion of its own." It is not only a defect, it is a danger!

Therefore, I would leave with you the exhortation of the man who set forth the theoretical and practical and institutional design for a creative effort such as this. Felix Adler, turning away from the fundamentals of Judaism and Christianity, said, in invocation:

> Consider mankind, and not primarily your individual self. Consider what the need of mankind is at the present day. Identify yourself with mankind. Think of yourself as part of man's life through the ages—so that you may come into contact with those great moments in which humanity put forward a living effort, and so that you too may receive the contagion of the effort.

Epistle to John Ruskin

Time is a gill net, John, that draws harsh cords about
the face and leaves its print.
Men make loud voices, but hands do not obey; strong
and skilled, they tug with Time at the net.
The furrows are sprung elastic of the flesh . . . but are
crumples of soul come to the casement.

"Neither is singing songs about God, serving God."
Remember saying that?
Remember the little "crossing-sweeper"? Now he is
neither little nor big, young nor old, but perennial,
like the Wandering Jew.
Neither Jew nor gentile, though, nor of any nation,
he sweeps the crossings in all lands.
And tight-laced cliques, with tags of Capital and Labor
on their Sunday coats, grudge him pennies passing.

Egos still are foolish little *-cidal* systems, John, unknowing that *homi-* foreruns *sui-;* long-pull cause
and effect.
Schisms are still imposers and imposed upon, though
bribery for inertia has increased.

Mistrusting trades, loathing machines, it is well you
quit before cuckoo clock gave way to radio plug.
Outward turns are many, John, these fifty years. Inward turns are none.

LeGarde S. Doughty

Ingrid and the Bomb

HERBERT H. STROUP

Two items of current interest, found side by side in the daily newspapers, remind us afresh of the confused standards we seek to apply to personal and social problems. The world's emotions run freely and sensitively toward the poor little rich girl, Ingrid Bergman, in her personal problem. The cold shoulder of an insensitive and calculating world conscience is shown toward the Hell-Bomb.

Reinhold Niebuhr some years ago said that man is moral and society is immoral. Can we so easily separate them today? Is man really so moral?

The confusion of standards is evident even within the Christian churches. The Pope, for instance, who, it might be thought, should be tremendously busy these days with the threat of the Hell-Bomb, seems to have nothing to say about this most grotesque monstrosity of the ages. Yet, his churchmen are filling columns of newsprint with the Roman Church's concern lest the illegitimate child of Miss Bergman (and Ingrid herself) not be fully acceptable to Peter's See. So, too, with the Protestants. Sermons on the Hell-Bomb seem to be few and far between, and it is interesting to note that it was a group of physicists, rather than of ministers, who were the first to speak against its use.

Where the aging Hollywood actress is concerned, our hearts so freely bleed with compassion and friendly overtures of conciliation. True it is that some individuals and groups have been indignant, but in the main appropriate words of the Scriptures have readily been found: "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her." Where is this conciliatory attitude in international relations? Some sermons lament the very existence of Russia in the world of nations. As for the newspapers, the *New York Herald Tribune* in a sermonizing mood editorialized on the bomb that it would rather see the United States use the bomb than for Americans to be "sitting this one out" in the cold wastes of torturous Siberia. As though that were the unalterable choice!

The interest of the public in the social import of the Hell-Bomb is mostly lethargic. Where it is aroused, however, it is chiefly calculating. The lethargy of the people is symbolized by a report contained in the Winter issue of the *Public Opinion Quarterly*. The following question was asked of a representative sampling of fellow citizens: "Have you ever written or wired your Congressman or Senator in Washington?" In September, 1949, eighty-one out of one hundred persons said that they had never written or wired. Sixty-one per cent of college graduates had never written or wired; seventy-nine per cent of the high-school graduates, and eighty-nine per cent of grade-school graduates had never written or wired. Mind you, these persons had never written about anything, not even about the terrible new weapons of destruction being sanctioned by our government. Those community leaders who have tired of telling audiences that they should write to Congressmen or Senators may well renew their support of this social action technique.

It is not so hard to stimulate the interest of the public in the case of Ingrid Bergman. In fact, "Stromboli" is now a gold mine. Above the minor raging of a few came the satisfied and exuberant words of the Hollywood publicist saying that her studio was so busy releasing the film on the exact day of the birth that it could not be concerned with the implicatons of the illegitimacy. Does not this response deeply mark the all-too-easy conscience of the American public toward its sentimental heroes?

But, not all of the public is lethargic toward the Hell-Bomb. Some people fortunately have spoken about it, constructively and sincerely. But, how often are the issues of personal morality divorced from the universal implications of this new weapon of destruction? Too many of our political leaders speak of our foreign policy as though it were really "foreign," as though it did not express the inwardly held convictions of immoral men regarding their own frightened personal existence. Obviously our "foreign policy" is not external to us as individual human beings. It is, moreover, about as "domestic" as any policy we have, since we live in a family of nations. Many families, too, have their Peck's Bad Boys.

The calculated character of "foreign policy" is evident with startling transparency, to choose only one illustration, in the February 6th "Statement of Principles and Objectives Adopted by the Republican Members of the House of Representatives and the Republican Members of the Senate, and Concurred in by the Members of the Republican National Committee." After many words about "foreign affairs," the Statement gets around to the very practical issue of "aid" to those states resisting Communism. Five qualifications are suggested on the giving of such aid, namely: (1) only if it is essential to our national security; (2) if it is within the total limits which the American economy can afford; (3) if it will be effective; (4) if it is beyond the ability of the aided nation to supply for itself, and (5) if there is a program of progressive reduction. These five qualifications comprise one of the politest statements in recent times virtually favoring no "foreign" assistance at all. Where is the element of "moral risk" so praised by professional ethicists? How can the statement be interpreted as being other than crude self-interest? Where is the generosity shown to Ingrid?

Unitarian Service Committee

9 Park St., Boston 8, Mass.

An annual contribution of $5.00 or more makes you a member of the Unitarian Service Committee. If there is a chapter in your church, join it at once; if no chapter exists, mail your membership fee to the Boston office of the Committee.

Between an Atom and a Star

PETER H. SAMSOM

"What is man, that thou art mindful of him?" asked the unknown writer of the ancient psalm, and uncounted centuries of religion and philosophy have echoed the query. "What is man?" we still ask today, with our wealth of unprecedented knowledge. Mankind has been eternally questioning himself and the heavens above him, to learn his own nature and to discover where he stands in the universe, and as we look back over the ages of his questioning, there sometimes seems to be very little evidence that he is very much closer to a satisfying and durable answer than he ever was.

Each period of human thought comes forward with an answer that reflects its own current religious dogmas and intellectual fashions, and only now and then do we catch the sound of a really questing thinker trying to appraise our human nature in the light of what we actually know about ourselves. Our thinking comes and goes in fashions. From one age to another, the pendulum swings from one extreme to another, as men react away from one excess only to commit its opposite. We have in current religious thinking a revealing example of this seesawing. Several of America's most gifted, influential thinkers in religion seem today to be completely "sold" on one of these extremes, and are earnestly telling their publics that man is doomed by reason of his evil nature, that the Biblical legend of the fall of man in the Garden of Eden is fundamentally true after all, that we are all wretched sinners deluded by our false pride in ourselves, and that we can be saved from God's wrath only by embracing some variety of supernaturally revealed "truth."

Now, of course, men of the ability of a Fulton Sheen or a Reinhold Niebuhr cannot be utterly wrong. They are well-read, thoughtful men who view the modern scene with all of its tragedy, its hatreds and its nationalistic lust, and warn us that the blithe social optimism of the past century was in error and that man is not by any means progressing onward and upward forever as if on a spiritual escalator, nor is man really a Little Lord Fauntleroy at heart. But what are these thinkers doing after all but swinging back to the opposite extreme, just as mistaken as the one they have rejected? In the last analysis this develops into a mere contest between rival dogmas, both airtight and factproof—one, the ancient religious dogma that man's heart is evil, the other the modern, popular dogma of automatic, inevitable progress. If we are to achieve any light on the matter, we shall have to try to get at the truth about ourselves in another way.

Man, Arthur S. Eddington points out in his fascinating book, *Stars and Atoms,* is almost halfway in size between an atom and a star. Then, to give us an idea of the enormously vast scale by which he is measuring man, he reminds us that there are smaller things than atoms and larger units than stars. If we include the very smallest things we know and the very largest, then man is found to occupy a position nearly two-fifths of the way up the cosmic scale from the electron to the all-embracing scope of the universe. "But so vast is the scale," he says, "that to be halfway up he would have to be as big as a million big trees rolled into one. Even if we were to take the two billion people now inhabiting the globe as constituting but one single organism, this would still be more than ten times too small. Individual man is nearly halfway between an atom and a star; humanity entire stands in the same position between an electron and the universe."

Eddington is talking merely about the size of the human body, comparing it with the rest of the universe great and small, and we know that size in itself has nothing to do with quality or character. Man could be utterly insignificant or utterly overwhelming in size, and still we would know nothing of the kind of being he is, of the quality of his mind and heart. Yet there is something in this statistical approach to man which appeals to the imagination!

So man is halfway between an atom and a star—in the language of science, this means one definite thing, but think what a poet could do with that phrase! He could lift it out of the realm of statistics and transform it into an exciting symbol of the nature of man himself and his position in the life of the universe! Of course, scientists do not like to have poets messing around with their concepts and turning their careful statements into dreamy metaphors, but the suggestion in Eddington's words is so tempting that we just cannot leave it alone, whether we are poets or not! Let us see what we can do with it without being completely fantastic. Does it not suggest something to our minds about the age-old question of where man stands in this mysterious universe?

First, to say that man is halfway between an atom and a star helps us to correct a false but very popular notion, the idea that man is utterly insignificant and puny in comparison with the universe as a whole—and here we are still staying with the scientist's meaning. How often we have heard it lamented: "Beside the vastness of the universe we now know about, we are as a mere driblet in the ocean of existence!" And with that there usually goes some doleful reflection about how unimportant our human concerns are, because they seem so little in the universe as a whole.

But actually, when the whole picture is taken into account, man is not tiny at all! If we remember to include in the picture the infinitely small as well as the infinitely great, man turns out to be quite a respectable distance up the size scale, if it is size we are talking about. Indeed, if Eddington is correct, man is almost as much greater than the electron as the total universe is greater than man, yet we have been so overwhelmed by the vastness of astronomical space that we have assumed our own utter insignificance as compared with it, forgetting that compared with almost half the scale of natural existence we know about, man is actually a rather enormous creature!

After all, our final judgment on man does not rest in any way upon the question of his size. What appeals to our imagination in Eddington's placing us between an atom and a star is rather this: that just as man is a midway point with respect to his size, may he not also be a midway point in other and more important and interesting ways?

Let us look at the matter of our knowledge—our knowledge of the world, the earth, living things, of the human body and mind and the mind's workings. Would anyone seriously claim that we have attained to no really significant amount of knowledge as a race?

Would anyone seriously claim, on the other hand, that we are anywhere near the limits of our possible knowledge, that we have achieved all we need to? These appear to be ridiculous claims as we state them thus baldly, yet they have been made and are being made today, both of them, by men who ought to know better, men who lack the perspective of the long view of man, by those who have never reflected that we are somewhere between an atom and a star, that we are in the making as intelligent creatures, with a long past of magnificent growth behind us and in all probability a very long and productive growth ahead of us about which we can only guess from where we stand today.

Our religious pessimists are fond of claiming that what we know about ourselves and our universe is very little, that even though it fill whole libraries and though millions of dollars' worth of laboratories are devoted to its extension, still it is insignificant, and we remain weak creatures groping in the darkness of our ignorance and the evil of our depraved hearts. And our modern optimists, on the other hand, with a reverse twist, talk as though we have arrived, as though we have achieved the pinnacle of our progress in wisdom, and in a few more years we shall know all there is to know, for cultural salvation is just around the corner. We do not say this in so many words, of course, but we often act as if we believed it.

But in the perspective of the atom and the star, in the perspective of the infinitely long past behind us and the inconceivably long future ahead of us as a race, such simple pessimisms and optimisms become pathetic and ridiculous. Both assume that man is more or less a finished product, without much of either a past or a future, and it must be admitted that the myths of the Christian religion, with its Day of Creation and its Day of Judgment, have not done much to correct this mistaken set of concepts about man. Both forget that just as man stands between the atom and the star physically, so does he stand in mental and spiritual growth somewhere between the little and the great, between his past and his future, between what he is and what he is yet to be.

Only if we allow ourselves to forget that we are in the making still, somewhere between what we once were and what we yet shall be, only then can we fall into the folly of making fixed absolutes of our present standards, only then can we act as if the little or much that we know today marks the limit of our human capacity. But once these artificial walls of our imagination are broken down and we appreciate man's true position, once we see ourselves as we really are, between an atom and a star, then the creative truth of our lives at last becomes real for us; then we can know that just as man stands today far above where he once was in knowledge and wisdom, so will he one day attain a position which makes even the heights of his present achievement look like the primitive grubbings of the apeman in his dirty cave do to us!

No, it will not be automatic. Such progress will not fall into the laps of our distant future descendants any more than it fell into the laps of Socrates, of Galileo, of Darwin or Freud. Progress of any kind is painful and effortful, and lays stern demands upon us; it demands of men that they keep a growing edge to their minds and spirits, that they remain flexible and alert—and even skeptical of all that seems most certain at our present state of development. No progress is unearned or automatic, *but it is possible,* and it has taken place even in our brief experience as humans, despite all our doleful theologies and our easy complacency with the present achievement of man. For we are somewhere between an atom and a star, between our beginnings and our destiny, somewhere between our least and our greatest capacities as a race.

Now, we have been thinking about the growth of man's knowledge, reasoning that there is no good reason to place any boundaries around its future. But it hardly needs to be said, does it, that knowledge is not necessarily wisdom or goodness, that there is often quite a difference between knowing what is good and doing it in practice and making it a way of life? With the aid of his unique new weapon of knowledge and his ability to apply his intelligence to his problems, man has become the dominating species of animal life. In the course of a few thousand years, a mere fleeting moment in geological time, he has survived and beaten down all opposition, and now holds the position once held successively by fishes, reptiles, and the mammalian titans of past epochs. This has been a stupendous achievement, not to be casually depreciated by any temporary discouragement or short-scale pessimism about man. It is almost a miracle of evolution!

But withal, marvel as we may at man's astonishing survival value, and at his ability to outwit the forces about him by his nimble intelligence and by his capacity to change and adapt himself, it does not take a very wise or learned man to realize that man has won only part of the battle—and probably the easiest part at that. Having developed his marvellous weapon of intelligence, he has found himself handling a double-edged sword that can cut both ways. Armed with knowledge of every conceivable aspect of his life, he is not potentially able to shape a more abounding and secure and satisfying life than his ancestors ever were able to—but by the very same token, he is also able to destroy with a new and dreadful precision, and spread havoc on a larger scale than he has ever before known, till it has become possible even to imagine him destroying himself as a significant form of life!

This modern situation, unparalleled in the history of human life, has led many to form some extremely unhappy conclusions about man and his future, and little wonder, for our knowledge seems at times to have outstripped our ability to use it for social good, for world unity or even for personal peace of mind. But once again, we can see what happens when theologians and philosophers despair of man's hopes under these modern conditions. When they are in such moods, they seem to forget the all-important element of Time.

How old is the earth? Possibly a thousand million years. How long has life existed on the earth? About 350 million years, we are told. And when did man finally appear? Only about a million years ago. His known recorded history conventionally begins about 4,000 years ago, and the time during which he has possessed any scientific knowledge at all, beginning say with the ancient Greeks, is 2,500 years at the most, a mere tiny fraction of the age of man himself, while science in its modern, critical form is only 400 years old. In relation to the time he has been around, this historical period of civilization with which we are familiar is a mere moment of time, yet on the basis of what we have achieved or failed to achieve in that tiny instant of time, we are naive enough to turn cart-

wheels of joy or to throw up our hands in cosmic despair about man's future! It just does not make sense, this short-term appraisal of human life and human destiny.

The patience of the long view! This is what a realistic perspective on man's life can give us. It can remind us that the age of man is but a moment on the clock of time, and that there lie before us in all probability many days and years of such moments, time to correct man's errors, time for him to outgrow his childish superstitions about himself and society and the universe, time to flex his social and spiritual muscles, and time to begin to fulfill his immense possibilities as a creature who has developed intelligence and a sense of human unity.

It is fortunate, indeed, in a reverse sort of way, that there are in our present world and our immediate future certain threats and dangers which will not permit us to relax too comfortably in the assurance that time aplenty lies ahead to correct our mistakes. There may be untold ages ahead for the future evolution of human society, but surely we know that unless we tend resolutely now to the present business of ridding the world of war and hunger, and learning to live as fellow humans on the only earth we have, there may not be very many or very healthy human beings around to enjoy that infinite future!

But even this danger can be seen in more sensible perspective than has been the case with many of our prophets of atomic doom; for man has faced annihilation before, he has faced what seemed certain destruction by some catastrophe he could not seem to cope with, and somehow he has survived or avoided complete disaster. What was it that Emerson said? "The great lesson of life is to believe in what the centuries say as against the hours."

Between an atom and a star we stand, and slowly we learn that the dogmas of human weakness and of human perfection are but half-truths, and dangerous ones. Gradually we are becoming aware of our infinite past, of our rich heritage of natural life; gradually we are becoming conscious that the little moment within which we enact our life-drama is but a flick of a motion in the eternal epic that has no beginning nor ending so far as our groping minds can discern. Our world seems so old to us who now live, but in time's wise perspective it is but a world begun, a world well-started, with dangers, challenges, promises, and resources enough to absorb all our devotion.

What Is This Neo-Orthodoxy?

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY

By Neo-Orthodoxy we mean that contemporary movement in the world of Protestant religion and theology which seeks to reinforce and revitalize the traditional pattern of doctrine and practice commonly referred to as "conservative" or "Fundamentalist" by rationalizing the ancient creeds, reasserting conventional Biblicism, and reëmphasizing the alleged "essentials" of historic Christianity. This movement, which should properly be called a reversion to ancient type rather than a revival of ancient truths, delights in casting scorn and ridicule upon religious Liberalism, in glorifying God at the expense of man's dignity, and in exalting an outworn and outmoded authoritarianism at the expense of liberty of conscience and true freedom of worship and conviction.

This movement is primarily a reversion to primitive types of superstition and fear-psychoses in regard to such fundamental truths of religion as those dealing with God, Man, Salvation, and the Good Life. Here the champions of Neo-Orthodoxy profess to be "Biblical" and "orthodox," i.e. in accord with the traditional teachings of the past. In actual fact they represent a retrogressive movement in both religious thought and life, a step backwards, an effort at apprehending truth and leading mankind not by bold adventure into new realms of moral and spiritual insight, but by servile submission to stereotyped patterns of dogma and creed and by naive acceptance of an authoritarianism which upon closer examination is nothing more than the ancient enemy which we know as clerical tyranny and ecclesiastical dictatorship with a new face.

But the leaders of the Neo-Orthodox movement are neither hypocrites nor fools; on the contrary, most of them are men of profound learning, of tried and approved scholarship, and of tested leadership as teachers, preachers, and organizers. If they are to be feared and if their movement is to be opposed it is precisely because they are both honest and capable; we must fight them with the same weapons they employ and with better and sharper ones, since our hands are not fettered by tradition and our spirits are not hampered by pseudo-truths and false values.

Characteristic of Neo-Orthodoxy, among other things, are its lack of humility and its lack of a sense of humor. Now, humility and humor are the special graces of God that man may use to prevent his falling into the grievous error of pride and vanity. The word humility is indeed often used by our Neo-Orthodox friends, but the virtue is rarely practiced. When you read their books and hear their sermons and lectures, your first impression is that of a cocksureness and a self-assertiveness that offend and repel; here are arrogant dogmatism, unequivocating "I-know-it-all" authority, unbending and unyielding superiority that are as irreligious as they are fundamentally unethical and ungodly. The voice of Neo-Orthodoxy speaks as though it knew all the secrets of the Almighty; as though it had been his counsellor through the ages; his very special confidant since the beginning of time; as though it possessed exclusively *all* truth, *all* conviction, and *all* faith. It speaks of God and Man, of Salvation and Immortality, of inspiration and revelation, and kindred subjects as though in its Bible it possessed the last word and the final dictum upon such themes, in its church it had discovered the final authority for the interpretation of all such truths, and in its traditions it had been assured of ultimate approval of its institutions of sacerdotalism and sacramentarianism. Such lack of humility is upon closer observation associated

with a definite lack of the saving grace of humor. Of course, these good people have never learned the wholesome art of laughing at themselves. They forget that one may do this and still take his faith and religion very seriously; but their Neo-Orthodoxy has nothing gracious or light about it. Even when it sings its saccharine hymns and explores its emotional liturgy and ritual, it cannot escape the wrath of an angry God who is so completely different from and superior to man that despite his love for mankind he must be appeased by the blood of his Only Begotten Son, faith in whose atoning death it is beyond the capacity of men to achieve, and only in the grace of God to give, with the dogmatic proviso that if men, their sinful impotence notwithstanding, do not seek such faith, they will be eternally damned. This Neo-Orthodoxy has lost none of its inherited rigidity, none of its lugubrious blue coloration, none of its despairing downward curve of the lips, none of its pathetic helplessness and hopeless pathos. Its theology, ritual, sacraments, and festivals call millions of our contemporaries to "come to Jesus," to be redeemed and saved by his blood, to submit to the canons and dogmas of the church, to taste the grace of God in the sacraments, and to place the salvation of their souls into the hands of preachers and theologians who at best are archeologists, dealers in antiques, custodians of interesting if dusty relics, eloquent prophets of gloom, and virtuosi on the organ of doom.

We of the Church of the Free Spirit defy and challenge Neo-Orthodoxy as a revival of that orthodoxy which Unitarianism was born to deny, and we challenge it on these three significant counts: (1) It is sacrilegious in its view of God; (2) it is offensive in its view of man; (3) it constitutes an invitation to the forces of tyranny and Fascism to enter and control our religious life. Neo-Orthodoxy caricatures man's image of God and blurs his vision of the Divine. The God of Neo-Orthodoxy is omnipotent enough to create man "good" and "in his image," but he is not omnipotent enough to prevent a Devil from making God's handiwork evil and compelling God to intervene and to restore his "good creation" in a manner that is so dramatic as to appear theatrical and so unnecessary as to be offensive. The God of Neo-Orthodoxy makes man an allegedly free agent only to take genuine freedom of choice from him after one so-called "fall" into sin. Such a God makes a farce of freedom and a comedy of justice, and the drama of salvation becomes in its Neo-Orthodox interpretation a cheap comic opera. Neo-Orthodoxy insults God by creating him in the image of men that have grown blind digging in texts and ruins of antiquity; it makes of the Eternal One a God of theological moles and grave-diggers, not a God who may be worshipped in the beauty of holiness and in freedom of spirit. We challenge Neo-Orthodoxy because of its sacrilege against God whom it degrades, dethrones, and lowers to the level of one of the ancient pagan deities.

And Neo-Orthodoxy offers insult to the dignity and divine stature of man. It makes of him in one and the same breath a child of God and an instrument of the Devil. It says that God created man good but not good enough to withstand sin, and that after his first fall into error and transgression man has now become so corrupt and evil that his own repentance and good works cannot save him but that such "salvation" can only be achieved by supernatural interference of God himself. The form of this "supernatural" act of God's grace and mercy is supposed to be documented in the pages of the New Testament, especially in the story of Calvary. Neo-Orthodoxy makes of man a creature of God's love, then an object of God's vindictive wrath, and finally a toy of God's romantic whims. Neo-Orthodoxy speaks eloquently of the worth of man in the sight of God, and then sets out systematically to cheapen man's nature, to defile his personality, to lower him in his own sight, and then to make amends by declaring pompously and piously that only so degraded and demeaned a creature is finally worthy of God's mercy and love, and that only by "saving" such a sinful worm and despicable object can God be "glorified." It tells man to be good, to obey God's laws, and then adds that all obedience and goodness are so much dross and filth, that nothing avails sinful man but the freely given grace and undeserved mercy of God. It calls men to fight against sin; tells them that this fight is vain; and then seeks to comfort them with theological double-talk that can console only with the narcotic of confusion and the anesthesia of superstition. If Neo-Orthodoxy's doctrine of God is sacrilege, its doctrine of man is fraud; and a religion compounded of sacrilege and fraud can only be a dangerous delusion and a snare.

Neo-Orthodoxy opens the doors wide to religious Fascism. Its doctrine of absolute authority, based on one book, one church, one creed, invites every sort of religious charlatan and spiritual demagogue to exalt his wares and to peddle his spurious spiritual goods. The empty pretentions of Neo-Orthodoxy are apparent today; in its name countless churches, cults, and sects are clamoring for the loyalty and obedience of men, and every one of these voices presumes to speak with the ultimate authority of God himself and to denounce and damn anyone else presuming to speak with like authority. Whereas religious freedom, freedom of conscience, of worship, of organization make for unity in diversity and for that wider fellowship that is the guaranty of true Catholicity, Neo-Orthodoxy —like its older brother Orthodoxy—reveals its total inability to unite mankind and to bring order into the chaos and confusion of the present-day religious scene. This is inevitable, for Orthodoxy and Neo-Orthodoxy always are divisive, always schismatic, because they are always arrogant, always supercilious, always dictatorial, always authoritarian, always exclusive. Neo-Orthodoxy cabins, cribs, confines the movements of man's spirit; it is essentially parochial and provincial, static and decadent, while the religion of the Free Spirit offers man that opportunity for progress and advance that alone can challenge his native nobility and inspire his original capacity for goodness and divinity.

Within the nature and range and scope of the Church of the Free Spirit lie all the possibilities for Democracy in its most comprehensive and ecumenical meaning; within the narrow confines of Neo-Orthodoxy lie those sinister threats and those dark forebodings that spell moral disaster, spiritual disintegration, and defeat for the forces of progress, of freedom, of Brotherhood.

As we view the conflict between religious liberalism and Neo-Orthodoxy today, let us be called to awareness and watchfulness by these famous words of Joshua: "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve."

The Study Table

Books with a Meaning

POETS AND STORY-TELLERS. *By David Cecil. New York: The MacMillan Company. 201 pp. $4.00.*

STUDIES IN POETRY. *By Neal Frank Doubleday. New York: Harper & Bros. 380 pp. $2.25.*

THE FIRST ROMANTICS. *By Malcolm Elwin. New York: Longmans, Green & Company. 280 pp. $3.50.*

T. S. ELIOT: THE DESIGN OF HIS POETRY. *By Elizabeth Drew. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 216 pp. $3.00.*

TRIALS OF A TRANSLATOR. *By Ronald Knox. New York: Sheed & Ward. 113 pp. $2.00.*

These important books all deal with the subject of literature, its nature and meaning. Lord David Cecil is known to all of us by his clarity of thought and good judgment. In this, his latest book, he discusses the great in literature from Antony and Cleopatra to Virginia Woolf and E. M. Forster. Mr. Doubleday does the same with the poets ranging from the Greeks to Robinson Jeffers. Malcolm Elwin tells us in a straightforward way about Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Southey. This book is an excellent tonic for today, since these three poets lived in a time of tribulation brought in by the French Revolution. It is refreshing and thought provoking to see how the men a century and a half ago sought an answer to the problems that seem to be ever contemporary. Elizabeth Drew deals with the most baffling and thought provoking of the modern poets. Opinion continues to be much divided about the American born Eliot, who, like Henry James and many another, has sought a refuge abroad. Now that Mr. Eliot has been awarded the Nobel prize in literature, all readers feel that they must understand his symbolic method of writing. This book is probably the best general introduction to Eliot in existence. Elizabeth Drew, a graduate of Oxford, has reversed Eliot's slant for a literary home, and has come to America. Msgr. Knox deals with the translation of literature from one language to another, the Bible, in this case, from Latin, the Vulgate, and the original Greek. With sparkling wit and much learning, Msgr. Knox tells simply and clearly the recent problem of giving Catholics a new version of the Bible, but his problems and answers apply equally to all who would know Biblical literature.

What can be more interesting than interpreting great books of the past to the present? Everybody tries to do it. The baby-sitter, who tells stories, is in the great succession. From the cradle to the grave, we all want to hear again the great literature of the world. Today when we are thinking in terms of the world, world literature is of greater importance than ever before. All colleges are rightly emphasizing world literature. These books will give everyone a good introduction to the best in literature. Get them and study them.

C. A. HAWLEY.

Christ a Yogi

HINDU VIEW OF CHRIST. *By Swami Akhilananda. New York: Philosophical Library. 291 pp. $3.00.*

A sympathetic portrayal by a Hindu teacher of Christ as an incarnation, an Oriental, and a Yogi, with discussions of the relationship of Christ to spiritual practices, everyday problems, and power. The Cross and the Spirit of Easter are also considered. Of especial interest is the attitude toward preaching, teaching, and Christian Missions. The author feels that those who have precious truths will naturally wish to share them, and, perhaps, even to convert others to them. Conversion, however, should be an inner transformation,

(*Continued on page 37*)

The Field

(*Continued from page 22*)

sponsored "peace movement" which held its first meeting here some weeks ago.

Behind the epithet of "liar," hurled at Mr. Sharett, and the charge that he is "a gossip who accepts the dictates of his American master," was Moscow's displeasure —stirred by reports from local Communists—at the efforts of the Foreign Minister to work out cooperation with the left-wing but non-Stalinist Mapam.

Concluding there is no real desire in Moscow for friendship with Israel, political circles here ask: "Don't the Communists realize that by such a calumnious attack on Mr. Sharett, who is honored by his people, they are making themselves a laughing stock and losing what little influence they may have?"

Northern Greeks Want Bouquets for U. N.

Athens. — Shrugging as Russia walks out again, people say that the United Nations never worked anyway. But the people of northern Greece do not shrug their shoulders this way about U. N.

They may not be aware of walkouts but they are aware of other points. The farmers and the refugees who fled the Communist guerrillas in 1947 look at their plump healthy children with deep gratitude. To these, the U. N. International Children's Emergency Fund has been supplying a daily cup of hot chocolate and hot meals four times a week.

Such is the feeding received by 642,465 children throughout northern Greece. UNICEF has also distributed blankets, shoes, soap, and cod liver oil to them. Thanks to UNRRA, their houses, many burned by the Nazis, bear new roofs too.

Once malaria and tuberculosis were feared as the most widespread and destructive diseases in Greece. But by spraying fields and swamps with DDT, the World Health Organization, a specialized U. N. agency, has cut out three-fourths of the malaria. In some communities the rate was trimmed from 80 to 5 per cent. As a result, farmers are producing 70 per cent more food than they could before.

To prevent tuberculosis, UNICEF and WHO are cooperating in a vast program to vaccinate three million Greeks. Already, about 675,000 have been tested for immunity and 440,000 vaccinated with BCG.

To the Greek villager, in short, the U. N. is not something to be kicked about, but a living, constructive element in his daily life.

—Worldover Press

The Study Table

(*Continued from page* 36)

not a changed group relationship, and should be attempted only by truly illumined souls. The author resents the assumption made even by the more enlightened missionaries, that Christianity is "the last word in religion."

SYLVANUS M. DUVALL.

Functional Significance of Values

TREATISE ON VALUES. *By Samuel L. Hart. New York: Philosophical Library. $3.75.*

Dr. Hart of Champlain College has written a perfectly delightful devastation of the current theological and philosophical return to sackcloth and ashes. Here is mental surgery applied to artificial distinctions between reality and value, and to values as mere emotional orgasms.

The author dismisses all absolute approaches to values as being sticky webs into which men spin themselves, thus in the long run relieving themselves of responsibility for the fabrication of a decent human society. The best proof against all fallacies in value theories is to see clearly the functional significance of values, and their role in sustaining and enhancing our social life. Only from this starting point is it possible to make coherent the confusing patterns of motivation which seem to control the lives of men.

The reader may wonder how this approach can avoid the nauseating delineations of a Nietzsche. Did not this bitter German philosopher first turn the searchlight of evaluation upon values? To be sure he did, and such evaluation is necessary. Nietzsche deserves credit for asking the right questions. He does not deserve it for the answers he gave.

Dr. Hart avoids Nietzsche's oracular nonsense because, in addition to asking the right questions, he continues to be scientific and rational in seeking out the answers. The result is a thoroughly admirable "Treatise on Values."

JACK MENDELSOHN, JR.

Oriental Mystery Religions Neglected

FORGOTTEN RELIGIONS. *Vergilius Ferm, Editor. New York: Philosophical Library. 392 pp. $7.50.*

A symposium by eighteen not prominent, but apparently qualified, authors. Most of the religions discussed are now extinct. A few are those of still existing "primitive" tribes. Some, like Mithraism, or the Mystery Religions of Greece, are historically significant because of their relationship to Christianity, or because they were once the faiths of mighty empires, such as Egypt, Assyria, or Babylonia. Others, such as those of the Hopi or Eskimos, are of anthropological or comparative interest.

It is to be regretted that more space was not given to the Oriental mystery religions, such as are associated with the names of Isis and Osiris, and their vital relationship to early Christianity duly noted. We wonder why, also, Manichaeism is included while the far more important Gnostic developments are omitted.

SYLVANUS M. DUVALL.

The Primacy of Ephraim

THE BIBLE AND MODERN BELIEF: A CONSTRUCTIVE APPROACH TO THE PRESENT RELIGIOUS UPHEAVAL. *By Louis Wallis. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press. 176 pp. $2.50.*

Certain of the conceptions evolved during more than two centuries of strenuous Biblical exegesis are challenged by Mr. Wallis in this little study. His argument calls for a revision of the conventional Judah-centered interpretation of Biblical history and of the standard formula for explicating the composite nature of the Old Testament text. Reasoning mainly from discrepancies in the narrative, after the manner of Wellhausen and other earlier scholars, Mr. Wallis, however, comes to the conclusion that the key to a proper understanding of the Old Testament is recognition of the Northern Kingdom as the primal area of Hebraic religious development. He contends that it was among the rural highland clans of legendary descent from Rachel's sons (clan-groups later known by the single designation, Ephraim) that monotheism and the prophetic tradition, associated with a strong sense of social justice, evolved and were kept alive despite powerful counter-influences. The rest of his argument is briefly this: The Davidic dynasty later consolidated peoples of mixed stock south of Ephraim. This Southern Kingdom, known under the legendary patronymic, Judah, became strong enough to dominate Ephraim temporarily. Then, when Ephraim was destroyed by the Assyrians and its people disappeared, Judah remained the sole repository of the tradition and literature originating in the North. But it required the harrowing experience of the Babylonian captivity to bring the remnant of Judah to a true appreciation of the religious message that it had inherited. At the same time tribal memories of the old hostility between Judah and Ephraim, together with the desire to reinforce Judah's right to carry out the Covenant, motivated the postexilic scribes to distort and elaborate the basically Ephraimite records to the advantage of Judah. "And so," concludes Mr. Wallis, "the little postexilic Jewish community became the 'bottleneck' through which we get all that we know about ancient, preexilic Israel."

Mr. Wallis fails, however, to explain adequately why, if this Southern remnant had only a peripheral relation to the prophetic religious and ethical tradition, it should have felt, in the first place, any compulsion to assume the burden of "Israel's world mission." The explanation he offers is appealingly dramatic but hardly evidence: "The Jews were terrified out of heathenism and shocked into the exclusive worship of Jehovah" by the "appalling destruction of Jerusalem" and the "frightful experiences" of the captivity.

Other aspects of Mr. Wallis' study offer nothing essentially new, although they are consistently drawn within the framework of his conception of Ephraimite primacy. There is nothing novel about the evolutionary view of monotheism or the idea that the prophetic impulse emerged from the rural populace in struggle against the economic exploitation and the religious corruption of metropolitan centers in Palestine.

The study is, in any case, a valuable supplement to the materials already available for an intelligent reading of the Bible. But there is much less value in Mr. Wallis' brief remarks purporting to relate his textual analysis to "modern belief." Here intrudes something

that suggests the kind of obscurantism for which his exposition is supposed to be an antidote. It is not apparent how the task of "presenting constructively . . . the original importance of Ephraim and the final consequence of Judah in the spiritual evolution of religion" is a "service" important "in the prevailing crisis of belief." In short, there does not seem to be much point to Mr. Wallis' subtitle. One cannot help wondering if this tenuous line of relationship has something to do with another of Mr. Wallis' interests. He is also the author of a work published in 1940 under the title: *Private Enterprise; the Most Precious Economic Force in Civilization.*

BERNARD BAUM.

Correspondence

Replying to Mr. Taylor

To UNITY:

After November 2, 1948, even the most skeptical must have realized that our daily press and magazines are no longer free, but that over 90 per cent are in the service of sinister and subversive powers, anxious to drive us into war with Russia, by their persistency of ignoring all news favorable to Bolshevism, burying that news which they must print into inside columns, and telling outrageous halftruths or outright lies besides. Among the few publications that have a clean hand and a pure heart on that subject, UNITY takes its place. It was, therefore, distressing to read the following in an article by Harry Taylor, on page 107 in the January-February issue: "Other men, also intoxicated with the lust of power, would use his [Hitler's] techniques, hoping to succeed where he failed. Indeed, at the present time in Russia the Nazi technique has been improved upon so as to make Hitler look like a piker."

Whatever differences of opinion we may have with Bolshevism, we know that the men who stood sponsor at the cradle of Bolshevik revolution, Lenin, Krupskaya (for she saw eye to eye and worked hand in hand with her husband, Trotsky, Kalinin, Stalin, and others, were idealists. And when by the accident of events, or history or both, a great nation fell into their lap, realizing that that nation was untutored, untaught, untrained—yes, the largest part analphabets—patriotic Russians that they were, the very first thing they did, as soon as they found security under their feet, was to set about educating the people, bringing about the eighth wonder of the world, by turning a nation of analphabets, into a people of literates in less than a generation.

How can these men be even mentioned in the same breath with Hitler, whose sole motives were greed for power and more power, who had no consideration for humanity. It can be understood how a man in the heat of battle can run his bayonet through the belly of his fellow man; it can even be comprehended how in the heat of passion a man can kill his own brother, but how can a human being sit at a roundtable, and have blueprints made for deliberately killing millions and millions of men, *women,* and *children?* Such a being is not human, he is a beast.

Our public press has succeeded in confusing our minds about Bolshevism, but there are certain things *we know.*

First: The aforementioned changing of analphabets into people who can read and write.

Second: Children from six to sixteen are compelled to attend school; on graduating, those who can pass an examination admitting them to a university may take advantage of it, the government paying them a salary during their attendance.

Third: The people are better fed and clothed than they were under the czars, in spite of the fact that Russia had to put up with a thirty years war.

Fourth: The people receiving the highest incomes in Russia today are authors, composers, teachers, musicians, actors, inventors, and all those contributing to the cultural life.

Fifth: Russia started out as anti-religious, but finding this a mistake the Bolshevists granted religious liberty.

Sixth: Bolshevism began as anti-capitalism, but seeing that was a mistake permitted a certain amount of capitalism. It is impossible for the uneducated and untutored mind to say "I am mistaken," yes, it is even hard for many an educated man. And the fact that this group of leaders in Russia have said it repeatedly shows that they are experimenting. As it is the first time in the world's history that a people with perfectly undeveloped minds are undergoing the process of civilization, their leaders must have a mighty hard time of it, as they have absolutely no precedent to go by. We ought to encourage them, instead of constantly holding the threat of war over their heads. People returning from Europe tell us that there is very little war talk going on over there, and I am sure that the people in this country are opposed to war, but our press is trying to drive us into it.

The Russians are not free today? Of course not, imagine what would happen if the Politburo would proclaim a Republic in Russia today! Carlisle, asked when the education of a child should commence, answered "a hundred years before it is born." It may take a hundred years before the Russians are advanced sufficiently to govern themselves, and when the time comes and liberation of the individuals does not take place from above, I am convinced that the people themselves will achieve it. It may take less than a hundred years. Meantime it is fortunate for the Russians and for the world that they have an intelligent and idealistic leadership.

When Hitler usurped the power in Germany, he got possession of 60 million practically and technically efficient people, a large portion highly educated mentally and the rest proportionately so, and one of the first things he did was to curtail education as much as possible, because he knew that the less the Germans knew, the longer his power would last. How can anyone compare the Bolshevik idealists to Hitler?

LEO KAUL.

Chicago, Illinois.

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

LINCOLN SUCCESS

The Annual Meetings of the Western Unitarian Conference held at Lincoln, Nebraska, April 28-30, 1950, were an outstanding success. There were 125 registrations, 82 of which were from outside of Lincoln. This is one of the largest out-of-the-city delegations in the recent history of the Conference.

The Lincoln church had everything superbly organized. The Conference was carried through with a degree of efficiency and smoothness unexcelled. Mr. Fred Putney, the chairman of the Planning Committee, Mr. Victor Seymour, President of the church, and Rev. Philip Schug, the minister, are to be congratulated on their planning, and the members of the church for their cooperation.

At the first business session Dr. Curtis W. Reese, President of the Conference, appointed the following to the Credentials Committee: Mrs. Homer Kyle, Lincoln; Mrs. Carl Schaad, Chicago; Mr. Dexter Brown, Denver; and Rev. Rex Aman, Quincy. On the Business Committee were Rev. Kenneth C. Walker, Bloomington; Rev. E. T. Buehrer, Chicago; Mr. Victor Seymour, Lincoln; and Mrs. Charles Van Dine of Dayton.

FIRST AFTERNOON

The Women's Alliance held an afternoon session under the leadership of Mrs. C. Sidney Neuhoff of the St. Louis church. Mrs. Neuhoff is the director of the Southern District of the Midwest Region of the General Alliance. The buzz session technique was used, and a panel discussion on the various committee activities of the Alliance was held. Serving on the panel were Miss Ruth Campbell, Mrs. J. Rippey, Mrs. Jonathan Andrews of Omaha, Mrs. Fred Putney, and Mrs. Walter Ernst of Lincoln.

At the same time the first annual meeting of the Western Conference Branch of the Unitarian Ministers Association was held. Rev. Kenneth C. Walker is President. Dr. Wallace W. Robbins, President of Meadville Theological School, presented the new B.D. and Ph. D. curricula of the Federated Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago. Rev. Randall S. Hilton gave a brief talk on what the Western Conference chapter could do, and conducted a discussion on the United Unitarian Appeal.

THE BANQUET

Some 170 people attended the Conference banquet held at the Y.W.C.A. Friday evening. Dr. James M. Reinhardt of the University of Nebraska was the toastmaster. Talks were given on the status of Unitarianism in Colorado and Des Moines, Iowa, by Rev. Rudolph Gilbert of Denver and Rev. Charles Phillips of Des Moines. An informative and stimulating address was given by Dr. Curtis W. Reese, Dean of Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, and President of the Western Unitarian Conference, on the subject "Recent Developments in Unitarian Thought and Life."

DREIKURS ON DEMOCRACY

Saturday morning and afternoon Dr. Rudolf Dreikurs, professor of psychiatry at Chicago Medical College and well-known Chicago psychiatrist, author and lecturer, spoke on the subject "Psychology for Democratic Living." Beginning with the psychological foundations for democracy in the home, Dr. Dreikurs developed this to its application in international affairs.

BUSINESS SESSION

At the business session, presided over by Dr. Reese, the following resolutions were passed:

(1). Rev. and Mrs. Arthur Weatherly.

WHEREAS Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Weatherly have had tremendous influence on the life of the denomination and of the Western Unitarian Conference; and

WHEREAS the Western Unitarian Conference is holding its annual meeting in 1950 in his old church in Lincoln, Nebraska: Therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Western Unitarian Conference at its 98th Annual Meeting send greetings to Mrs. Arthur Weatherly in appreciation of the inspirational leadership of her husband and herself throughout the denomination.

(2). Appreciation of the Lincoln Hospitality.

We, the members of the Western Unitarian Conference in session assembled in Lincoln, Nebraska, April 28, 29, and 30, 1950, hereby express — as individuals and as a Conference — to the members of the All Souls Unitarian Church, our cordial appreciation of the friendly hospitality which we have enjoyed throughout the three days of our meetings.

We are grateful for the many courteous services rendered from the moment of our arrival, the efficient management of the over-all conference program, and the constant and unfailing attention to the many details, large and small, by means of which the members of the church, the official board, the Alliance group, the hospitality committee, and the minister, Rev. Philip Schug, made our visit a happy and memorable one.

We congratulate the church membership and its minister on the many evidences of expansion and development which we have found here, and we look forward to the time when, having gone the rounds of our Conference, we may meet once again in Lincoln, Nebraska.

(3). Meeting Place of the Western Unitarian Conference.

WHEREAS it has been the practice of the Western Unitarian Conference to hold its annual meetings alternately in or near Chicago (on odd years) and outside the Chicago area (in even years): Be it

AFFIRMED, That we, the members of the Conference in attendance at Lincoln, Nebraska, April 29, 1950, do not regard this practice as a fixed precedent; and be it

AFFIRMED also, That we regard it as desirable to hold Conference sessions in as many of our sections and churches as possible, and that we welcome invitations from member churches in which we have not previously or recently met.

(4). International Association for Liberal Christianity.

WHEREAS the organization now known as the International Association for Liberal Christianity and Religious Freedom, as originally organized in 1900 in connection with the Seventy-Fifth Anniver-

sary of the American Unitarian Association was deliberately designed to include all persons of whatever religious tradition who strive to "unite pure religion with perfect liberty"; and

WHEREAS this design and purpose were manifest in the spirit of the discussion of the founders and in the name then chosen, and particularly in the name "Congress of Religious Liberals" adopted in 1907; and

WHEREAS, moreover, the present name of this organization identifies it with Christianity in a way not conducive to enlisting in its membership individuals and organizations with other religious origin and association: Therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Western Unitarian Conference urgently recommend to the American Unitarian Association that it use its good offices and its great influence to bring about such change in the name and the purpose of the International Association for Liberal Christianity and Religious Freedom as will restore to the organization the vision of the founders and make it an effective instrument of cooperation for all of whatever faith who strive in liberty to make religion effective in the life of the world.

(5). The United Nations.

WHEREAS war in existing circumstances is unthinkable; and

WHEREAS present tensions in the world have only intensified the necessity for finding at least such minimum areas of agreement as shall stave off annihilation; and

WHEREAS such a proposal as that of former President Herbert Hoover concerning the United Nations and the Soviet Union could only result in the death of the United Nations and in the final irreconcilable division of the world into two hostile camps; and

WHEREAS the United Nations with all its limitations is today the only place where the spokesmen of all nations must act in the spotlight of world public opinion, thus keeping a door open to possible agreement; and

WHEREAS, moreover, the United Nations has already clearly demonstrated its ability to serve as a constructive force in the political, social, and economic life of the world, in spite of the obvious difficulties created by the Russian delegation to the United Nations: Therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the delegates to the 98th Annual Meeting of the Western Unitarian Conference here assembled in Lincoln, Nebraska, reaffirm their devotion to the principles and purposes of the United Nations; and be it

RESOLVED further, That these delegates express their conviction that only a steady, consecrated search for minimum areas of agreement both within and without the framework of the United Nations can satisfy the spiritual demands of a democratic society, and that dramatic gestures of hopelessness and hostility, such as that suggested by Mr. Hoover, are a clear violation of responsibility in this frightened world.

(6). Planning Commission.

WHEREAS the Western Unitarian Conference is approaching its 100th anniversary and must make plans for the second century of a vigorous liberalism; and

WHEREAS Unitarianism traditionally has cherished the process of objective evaluation and the whole denomination for almost 15 years has benefited from a Commission on Planning and Review; and

WHEREAS the Western Unitarian Conference has taken leadership in the denomination to recognize that the vitality of freedom springs from the grass roots of our fellowship; and

WHEREAS, moreover, a new interest is stirring in our local churches for increased regional help in religious education, college work, and church extension: Therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Western Unitarian Conference assembled at its 98th Annual Meeting establish a Commission on Planning to review the constitutional structure and program of the Conference.

—The Commission should report to the constituent churches in the Conference and to the Board of Directors as soon as possible but no later than two months before the 99th Annual Meeting of the Conference in 1951;

—The Commission should be composed of five members, at least two of whom should be laymen and none of whom should be present officers or directors of the Conference;

—The Commission should be appointed by a special committee consisting of Curtis Reese, Lester Mondale, and Leslie Pennington;

—The Commission should have at its disposal for expenses $500 appropriated from the income of the Conference.

ELECTIONS

The following officers were elected for a term of three years:

President: Curtis W. Reese, Chicago, Illinois.

Vice-President: Tracy M. Pullman, Detroit, Michigan.

Secretary: Randall S. Hilton, Chicago, Illinois.

Treasurer: Herbert E. Clapham, Chicago, Illinois.

Members of the Board, elected for a term of four years:

Kenneth C. Walker, Bloomington, Illinois.

E. Burdette Backus, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Emory Balduf, Evanston, Illinois.

The report of the Treasurer showed the Conference in a solvent condition but feeling the pinch created by the failure of the United Unitarian Appeal.

DETROIT'S CENTURY

At the dinner meeting Saturday evening the Western Conference Branch of the Unitarian Historical Society considered the subject of "A Century of Unitarianism in Detroit." A most informative and scintillating talk on this subject was given by Mrs. Edgar G. Braun of the Detroit Church.

CLIFTON UTLEY

Saturday evening a public lecture on "Foreign Policy and the Future of the Nation" was given by Mr. Clifton Utley, NBC radio and television commentator. Mr. Utley's analysis of the present status of the struggle for power between the East and the West and his suggestions for American foreign policy were clear, forceful, and dynamic.

CONFERENCE SERMON

The concluding meeting of the Conference was held Sunday morning with the regular worship service. Rev. Philip Schug, minister of the church, conducted the service. Rev. Carl A. Storm of Minneapolis preached the sermon. His subject was "The Conservative, the Radical and the Liberal Mind."